

**REMARKS:**

Claims 10 and 20-43 are now pending in the application, with claims 1 and 35 being the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

There are now two independent claims and a total of 25 claims, so additional fee of \$125 (one hundred and twenty five dollars) for Claims in excess of twenty is enclosed.

The examiner has rejected Claim 13, 17, 18 and 19 on the ground that they are indefinite because they utilize the terms "may" and "can be." In preparing new claims, the applicant has taken care to avoid this type of rejection.

The examiner has rejected all the claims as anticipated by Kurematsu. The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The present invention and the device taught by Kurematsu are fundamentally different. In the present invention, a determination is made as to the intensity of light falling upon each pixel of a plurality of pixels. Each pixel's effect on light is then adjusted as a function of the intensity determination corresponding to that pixel.

In Kurematsu, no measurement is made with respect to the intensity of light falling on a particular pixel. Rather, the positioning of each pixel is "predetermined". The specification of Kurematsu explains as follows:

A television signal or video signal is applied to the piezoelectric actuator (pixel mirror actuator) of each pixel of the mirror device at a predetermined timing. Accordingly, each pixel mirror in the AMA sequentially executes tilt operation of a predetermined amount. [Col. 5, ll. 10-14.]

Serial No. 10/791,609


The new claims are supported by the specification and no new matter is added.

For the foregoing reasons, the pending claims are believed to be allowable over the applied art.

Dated: March 13, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

**JONATHAN PEERI**  
7050 Middlesbury Ridge Circle  
West Hills, California 91307  
Telephone: (818) 713-8486

By   
Jonathan Peeri